

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/584,610	NERENBERG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sam Rimell	2166	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Sam Rimell. (3) _____.
- (2) Jack Friedman. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 19 March 2002.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 35.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant agreed to cancel claim 35.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case unless both applicant and examiner agree that the examiner will record same. Where the examiner agrees to record the substance of the interview, or when it is adequately recorded on the Form or in an attachment to the Form, the examiner should check the appropriate box at the bottom of the Form which informs the applicant that the submission of a separate record of the substance of the interview as a supplement to the Form is not required.

It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Art Unit: 2166

An examiner's amendment to the record appears below. Should the changes and/or additions be unacceptable to applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided by 37 CFR 1.312. To ensure consideration of such an amendment, it MUST be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee.

Authorization for this examiner's amendment was given in a telephone interview with Jack Friedman on March 19, 2002.

Claim 35 has been cancelled.

Reasons for Allowance follow on the next page.

Reasons for Allowance

The present invention contains independent claims 1 and 19 which have been indicated as allowable.

Claims 1 and 19 have been examined for issues of utility under 35 USC 101. Examiner has considered the affidavit of Dr. Arnold Nerenberg dated January 8, 2001 and has found the evidence therein as demonstrating the utility of the present invention. Dr. Nerenberg is a licensed psychologist in the state of California and presents a sworn statement as to the effectiveness of the invention in psychological practice. Accordingly, claims 1 and 19 are found to meet the requirements of 35 USC 101. Claims 4-10, 12-17 and 20-21 similarly meet these requirements.

Claims 1 and 19 have been considered in light of the prior art of record. Two references are considered to be the closest prior art. These are: (1) The subject matter of theatrical performances cited by Official Notice in the action of September 6, 2001; and (2) The reference to Brocato et al. (U.S. Patent 5,256, 068).

Claims 1 and 19 both contain limitations which differentiate from the subject matter of a theatrical performance. Claim 1 has been amended to state that the person in the coffin is not acting in a theatrical performance and is not rehearsing for a theatrical performance. Such a limitation is consistent with the content of the disclosure, is definite under 35 USC 112 (See MPEP 2173.05(i) related to limitations of this type) and avoids the subject matter of theatrical performances. Claim 19 differentiates from this subject matter by defining a questioning step with predetermined fixed responses followed by an evaluation step to determine if a therapeutic method should proceed. Such features are not believed to be found in the context of theatrical

performances. Accordingly, claims 1 and 19 distinguish from the subject matter of theatrical performances.

Claims 1 and 19 also differentiate from the subject matter of Brocato et al. In Brocato et al., a doll is placed into a coffin and is used to teach a child about death and separation. However, the doll is not a person and both claims 1 and 19 require that the individual appearing in the coffin be a living person. Furthermore, it would not have been obvious to modify Brocato et al. to replace the doll with a living person, given that the coffin is miniature and the game calls upon the child to move the individual into the coffin and manipulate the coffin as part of the game. Accordingly, claims 1 and 19 are allowable over the subject matter of Brocato et al.

Claims 1 and 19 are therefore allowable over the above recited prior art, and the prior art of record. Claims 4-10, 12-17 and 20-21 are dependent claims and are allowable with claims 1 and 19.

It is noted that Examiner has also requested an independently performed database search using the search resources of EIC 2100. The search results are presented in the file. The search results have identified three documents which are relevant to the claims, but are not applicable as prior art under 35 USC 102 or 35 USC 103 since they pertain to discussions by the inventor of record with public media less than one year prior to the filing of the present application. Accordingly, these references are not applicable as prior art. The references have been cited on Examiner's Notice of References attached to this action to complete the file record.